

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-5 have been examined and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and claims 1 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Also, the Examiner has indicated that claims 4 and 5 contain allowable subject matter.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In specific regard to claim 1, the Examiner is unsure how the sampling pulse is relevant to the claimed filter recited in the preamble. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 1 in a manner believed to overcome the objection.

As set forth in amended claim 1, the first-order input feedback coefficient b_1 and the second-order input feedback coefficient b_2 are set *when* a sampling pulse, for processing digital signal processing, is set to a frequency six times as large as a central frequency of a passing frequency band of the second-order bandpass IIR digital filter. Thus, the sampling pulse is relevant to the setting of the input coefficients of the claimed filter. In this regard, Applicant refers the Examiner to the non-limiting embodiments on page 2 of the present Application. Applicant submits that one skilled in the art of such filters would not deem the claimed subject matter as indefinite.

Applicant has amended claims 3 and 5 in a similar manner as claim 1. The amendments were discussed during the March 27, 2006 Examiner Interview. The Examiner indicated that such amendments appear to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Further, the Examiner indicated that the current recitations of claim 4 are definite, and therefore

the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, would be withdrawn. Thus, claim 4 has not been amended.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as allegedly not disclosing a utility. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 3 in a manner believed to overcome the rejection. Such amendments were discussed during the March 27, 2006 Examiner Interview. The Examiner indicated that the amendments appear to overcome the rejection. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 3.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

As set forth above, the Examiner has indicated that claims 4 and 5 contain allowable subject matter.

IV. Conclusion


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/822,374

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino
Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 7, 2006